



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,354	06/06/2001	Jody L. Terrill	1006137-1	9168

7590 11/14/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

WU, QING YUAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2194

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/14/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/876,354

Applicant(s)

TERRILL ET AL.

Examiner

Qing-Yuan Wu

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-20, 22-33 and 35-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-20, 22-33, and 35-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14, 16-20, 22-33 and 35-43 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereafter AAPA), in view of Kujirai et al (hereafter Kujirai) (US Patent 6,618,566).

4. Kujirai was cited in the last office action.

5. As to claim 27, AAPA teaches substantially to collect and correlate pre-print and post-print information[AAPA, pg. 1, line 23-pg. 2, line 4], the preprint information being obtained from a host operating system [AAPA, pg. 1, lines 25-26] and the post-print information being obtained from a peripheral device that is configured to print jobs [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-4] and to

store the correlated pre-print information and post-print information for later reference [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-14].

6. AAPA does not specifically teach a job information module to assign unique job identifiers to print jobs. However, Kujirai teaches associating a job identifier with a print job when spooling the print job in the spooler (prior to sending the job to a printing device) [Kujirai, col. 7, lines 24-51; 402, Fig. 4]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combined the teaching of AAPA with the teaching of Kujirai because the teaching of Kujirai would improve the ease of identifying a print job with its corresponding job identifier.

7. Claims 1-14, 16-20, 22-26, 28-33, and 35-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Kujirai as applied to claim 27 above, in view of Kassan et al (hereafter Kassan) (US PG Pub 20020161717A1).

8. Kassan was cited in the last office action.

9. As to claim 1, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 27 above. In addition, AAPA and Kujirai do not specifically teach correlating using the unique job identifier. However, Kassan teaches correlating information based on an identifier [Kassan, pg. 9, paragraph 173]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made, to have combined the teaching of AAPA and Kujirai with the teaching of Kassan because the teaching of Kassan can improve the correlation of print information by simply matching/correlate print information based on the same identifier.

10. As to claim 2, AAPA as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the pre-print information is received from an operating system [AAPA, pg. 1, lines 25-26].

11. As to claim 3, AAPA as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including wherein the post-print information is obtained from a peripheral [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-4].

12. As to claim 4, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above. In addition, AAPA as modified teaches a facsimile machine [Kujirai, col. 17, lines 29-30].

13. As to claim 5, AAPA as modified does not specifically teach SNMP Gets. However, AAPA as modified disclosed an application in a management server that obtains the post-print information from the printer's job table [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-4]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have included various means of obtaining post-print information.

14. As to claim 6, AAPA as modified teaches the invention substantially including storing the unique identifier, the pre-print information and the post-print information [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-4; Kujirai, Fig. 4].

15. As to claim 7, AAPA as modified does not specifically teach sending the unique job identifier, the pre-print information and the post-print information to a job table on a peripheral. However, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to send the collected/correlated information to a different storage device for temporary storage prior to sending it to the management server.

16. As to claim 8, AAPA as modified teaches the invention substantially including sending the unique job identifier, the pre-print information and the post-print information to a management server [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-4; Kujirai, col. 5, lines 47-50].

17. As to claims 9-11, AAPA as modified does not specifically teach transferring the pre-print information and the post-print information to a management server upon realization of a threshold, wherein the threshold is selected from a group of thresholds comprising an elapsed time threshold, a storage level threshold and a print job quantity threshold, and adjusting a value at which the threshold triggers the transfer of data. However, AAPA as modified disclosed collecting pre-print and post-print information [pg. 2, lines 1-4]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized the

limited storage capacity of any storage medium and the importance of backing up essential information upon realization of reaching a certain threshold and adjusting the threshold as necessary.

18. As to claims 12-14, AAPA as modified does not specifically teach polling a peripheral to determine if the peripheral has finished with the print job, and polling step comprises varying the rate of polling as the peripheral works on the print job, and requesting the peripheral to send a trap with print information. However, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that post-print information cannot be obtained unless the print job is completed and provide a mean of communicating the completion.

19. As to claim 38, AAPA as modified teach the invention substantially including wherein associating is performed by a print server that receives the print job from a user device and forwards the print job to the printing device [col. 7, lines 49-51; AAPA, pg. 1, lines 10-11].

20. As to claims 39-40, AAPA as modified teaches the invention substantially including wherein the pre-print information includes information as to an owner of the document and as to an application that was used to create the document [AAPA, pg. 1, lines 17-19].

21. As to claims 41-43, AAPA as modified teaches the invention substantially including wherein the post-print information includes information as to time required to print, quantity of

Art Unit: 2194

toner used to print, and information as to success or failure of printing [AAPA, pg. 1, lines 20-22].

22. As to claim 16, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. In addition, AAPA as modified teaches sending the print job to a printer [Kujirai, col. 12, lines 51-53]. AAPA as modified does not specifically teach configuring a port monitor with a management server. However, AAPA as modified disclosed the method as recited in claim 1. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have include or configure a module to facilitate various task for the management server.

23. As to claim 17, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 9 and 16 above.

24. As to claim 18, AAPA as modified does not specifically teach generating a user interface on the management server that is supported by HTML. However, AAPA as modified disclosed an application for collecting pre-print and post-print information [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-4]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have include the user interface supported by HTML because it's well know in the art that it would improve the versatility by providing cross platform compatibility.

25. As to claims 19-20, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 4, and 12-13 above.

26. As to claims 22 and 31, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 1-2, 4, 16, and 19 above.

27. As to claim 23, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 20 above.

28. As to claims 24-26, these claims are rejected for the same reason as claims 9-11 above.

29. As to claims 28-30, these are system claims for performing method claims 1-2, 16 and 22. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 1-2, 16 and 22 above.

30. As to claims 32-33, these are computer readable media having computer readable instructions claims that correspond to the method claims 4, and 12-13. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 12-13 above.

31. As to claims 35-37, these are computer-readable medium having computer-readable instructions and computer having a processor capable of reading a computer readable medium claims that correspond to the method claims 1, 16, and 31. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 16, and 31 above.

Response to Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments filed 8/28/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
33. In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that:
- a. There is no proper motivation to combine the teachings of Kujirai with a process of collecting pre-print and post-print information and nothing in the prior art or in the Applicant's Background section that would suggest to or motivate a person having ordinary skill in the art to use Kujirai's job identifier to correlate pre-print and post-print information.
 - b. The Examiner has ignored the limitation "port monitor" in claim 27.
 - c. There is no proper motivation to combine the teaching Kujirai and Kassan with the process of collecting pre-print and post-print information because Kujirai and Kassan pertain to accounting system and Applicant admission say nothing about accounting.
 - d. Prior art of record failed to teach the limitations as recited in claims 5-7 and 10-13.
 - e. Examiner failed to address the limitation "wrapping".
34. Examiner respectfully traversed Applicant's remarks:
35. As to point (a), the examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Kujirai's teaching of job accounting information pertains to the information relating to a user's print job after the print

job is printed, namely post-print information. As being taught by Kujirai, a job identifier and/or job information associated with a print job when the job accounting client application spools the print job in the spooler and when the accounting/post-print information for the print job is returned, the information returned pertains to the same job [Kujirai, col.7, lines 24-67; Figs. 4-5].

Therefore, one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made will be motivated to incorporate the used of identification for print jobs of Kujirai for authentication purposed or for yielding the predictable result of identifying an entity. As per applicant's argument with respect to using job identifier in correlating pre-print and post-print information in claim 27, applicant's claimed invention does not support applicant's arguments. Claimed subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. If Applicant believes the limitation is important feature of the invention, it should be incorporated into the claims for further consideration. In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11,15 (CCPA 1978). More specifically, as recited in claim 27, there is no relationship between the job identifiers and the correlation of pre-print and post-print information.

36. As to point (b), the examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that a port monitor was neither precluded nor defined in the specification, therefore, software capable of performing the functions in the body of the claim satisfied the claim as a whole. In addition, applicant is reminded that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the

intended use, then it meets the claim. Applicant is directed to MPEP 2114 regarding functional languages in apparatus claims.

37. As to point (c), the examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Kujirai and Kassan's teaching of job accounting information and more specifically job accounting information pertains to the information relating to information of the sender of a job, namely pre-print information and information on detail of the job after the job is processed, namely post-print information [Kujirai, Figs. 4-5] are analogous prior arts and therefore obvious to combined.

38. As to point (d), the examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that SNMP Gets in claim 5 are well known in the art and AAPA's teaching of an application in a management server that obtains the post-print information from the printer's job table [AAPA, pg. 2, lines 1-4] suggest that the specific method of obtaining such information is irrelevant, therefore, using such well known method is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. As with the storing of unique identifier, pre-print and post-print information as recited in claim 6, the mere existence of these information in a computing device suggest that they are stored one way or another in the computing device either in volatile or non-volatile memories. As with claim 7, Kujirai disclosed a printer having job accounting function that accumulates and manages job accounting information (see point (c) above on examiner's interpretation of job accounting information), a server computer having a job accounting application which accumulates and manages received job accounting information from a job accounting client application with respect to the job performed on a conventional printer with no job accounting functionality [Kujirai, Fig. 1; col. 3,

line 37-col. 4, line 3], since the sending of such information and storing of such information was taught, the sending of such information to a specific location would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. As with the threshold of sending data with regards to time and/or capacity and polling for processing status, all these features are well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and would have been obvious to apply to various data processing/communication systems.

39. As to point (e), the examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that applicant's specification failed to neither preclude nor define the limitation "wrapping," therefore the examiner is interpreting the limitation for the same reason as the previous claims, namely the association of a job identifier with a job satisfied the limitation.

40. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Qing-Yuan Wu

Examiner

Art Unit 2194


WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER